Dear Jim,

12/24/74

Every time there is another of these incredible situations for which Bud is responsibile I am torn by another conflict, not just the one I refer to in the attached letter to Bud. If the mail hasn't come by the time I finish it, it will go out today. In any event, it and this will be mailed together.

The conflict is in deciding on the better or the least self-defeating course.

I know from a long history that if I were to say that water freezes at 32° but would disagree and believe I have some devious scheme in mind. I know he resents me personally, resents my rescues and above all his personal record of being proven wrong in this silly decisions. This is harder for him than admitting that I am right in these situations and in the anticipations of them. There is an unintended psychological admission in the nature of his reference to me in his letter to McKinley. I did not comment on it. But I also did not miss it.

Each time I have to worry, which is worse, taking all the time to try to get through his stubbornness and sick ego, which will at least initially antagonize him more, or doing nothing and running those risks. I am by no means certain, ever, because predicting what emotions and self-concepts will impel is at best hazardous.

In this case I tried, in haste, to put together a sufficient package. Not the way I intended speding the morning after skimming the Post to see if it added to Dan Schorr's report. (Remember that wasted morning or afternoon to which I took you with his soCalled investigator and the Newsweek "expert?" I easily resist the "I told you so" temptation. But Christ the permeating incompetence!) Predictably the Post doesn't even mention it and has sedited direct quotes in the editorial. So edited that it says what Helms did not. Nor does it recall its own incuriosity or that Helms picked the editors' convention for his false propaganda.

I'm still not going to do anything to hurt Bud. But I have to make still another effort to keep him from hurting himself and Jimmy with it.

What I don't remember does worry me. When we first had access to Jimmy 10/21 I alone did not have to be in chambers, so I spent that time with him. I don't recall what I'd told him of the plans we had made. I know that my disposition would have been to tell him everything. And not only because it was his right. So I may have told him that these motions were to have been the first order of business. If I did and if he remembers it and if he gets pissed off at Bud, Bud had better worry because while Jimmy has not really understood the legal significance of the violations of his rights or what a proper presentation could mean, he has a good mind and he is capable of seeing on his own what a CIA file on any of his defense could mean in his case.

Anyway, what I think this requires is that you move faster, if it is possible and if you agree. I have in mind an immediate call of the kind I mentioned yesterday again to CIA general counsel. Perhaps a communication with Shattuck, a gentle nudge on my meeting with him of May a year ago on this and his then encouragement that changed after I left. (This would require real diplomacy and perhaps, despite the probable initial negative reaction, Morgan might be better. Especially if you can tell him that I've had this all along and to your knowledge and with your participation.) It should occur to the legal eagles at CIA that added to the Baker disclosure on Bud what I have on them on me could at this point be unhelpful to them. More if they think that my Senator is one of those being heard in one of the more responsible ways.

Meanwhile, if I can sell the story for the appropriate numbers I will. I've made a couple of phone calls. One to Langley to get him to remind his people of the topicality of what I'd agree for them to use and what their delays has cost them. Much in WWIV is quite relevant, from Dulles to Ford.

Hastily,